

REMARKS

Claims 41-55 are pending. The Examiner indicated that the application contains claims directed to the following patentably distinct inventions:

GROUP I: Claims 45-47, 53-55 drawn to a bearing; and

GROUP II: Claims 41-44, 48-52 drawn to a process of making a bearing.

The Examiner has required Applicants to elect a single group for prosecution on the merits and Examiner has also further required a further species restriction if the product invention of GROUP I is elected.

By this Response, Applicants respectfully elect, without traverse, the invention of GROUP II relating to Claims 41-44 and 48-52, cancel Claims 45-47 and 53-55, and add Claims 56-61 directed to the process of GROUP II. As the product invention claims of GROUP I have been canceled, Applicants respectfully submit that no further species election is required.

Applicants note that Claims 44-47 and 52-55, as previously presented, inadvertently recited product claims depending directly or indirectly from independent method claims 41 and 48, respectively. Applicants have amended Claims 44 and 52 to properly recite a method consistent with GROUP II grouping of claims required by the Examiner. Applicants have also cancelled the inadvertent product claims, Claims 45-47 and 53-55, to comply with the restriction requirement and present these claims as newly added dependent method claims 56-58 and 59-61, respectively. Applicants respectfully submit that these newly added claims properly belong with the elected GROUP II claims from which they depend.

CONCLUSION


This response now includes a complete listing of all the claims.

In view of the foregoing, examination of the current application on the merits are respectfully requested.

The undersigned is available for telephone consultation during normal business hours.

Respectfully submitted,

October 29, 2004
Date


Leon Nigohosian, Jr.
Reg. No. 39,791

Michael Best & Friedrich LLP
100 East Wisconsin Avenue
Milwaukee, Wisconsin 53202-4108
Tel. 610-798-2176